

REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 21, 2002 with claims 1-22. Claims 1-22 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kressin et al. (United States Patent Number 5,617,527).

Independent Claims 1, 8, 12 and 22

Independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kressin et al. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Kressin discloses querying a user to information provided by each of the software applications (col. 3, line 62, to col. 4, line 8). In the Response to Arguments section of the final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that, "because of the correspondence, the command line interface has to query the GUI programmer to specify properties in order to create the correspondent GUI based on these properties."

In the Response to Office Action dated March 2, 2005, Applicants argued that Kressin teaches that:

the initial step of the invention, 500, is the creation of a Table which provides a correspondence between each command of an application program and a button. The button/command association (table) is *established by the GUI programmer*.
(Col. 3, line 65, to col. 4, line 2; emphasis added.)

Kressin teaches that the application program/button correspondence is incorporated into the program by the GUI programmer. Kressin does *not* disclose or suggest querying a user to specify the properties. Independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 22 require *queryin'g a user to specify properties* of one or more option groups provided by each of said software applications.

Thus, Kressin et al. do not disclose or suggest querying a user to specify properties of one or more option groups provided by each of said software applications, as required by independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 22.

Applicants acknowledge that, as the Examiner asserts, the user cited in the independent claims of the present invention could be the GUI programmer (Tool Developer 210 of the present invention). Applicants also note, however, that the present disclosure teaches that "the developer is then queried during step 540 to specify the properties of each *option group, i.e., for the constraints associated with a given option group, such as whether the various options within an option group can be used together*

and any input file requirements.” (Page 8, lines 15-18, of the originally filed disclosure.)

The disclosure also teaches that

the software applications have the following general syntax:

5 Tool_name [option 1] [option 2] <filename>
 where each of these *options* further can be of one of the following types {exactly one parameter; one or more than one; none or more and with or without an input file}. In this manner, the developer 210 or administrator can establish *groups and subgroups of parameters with similar properties*.
 10 (Page 8, line 28, to page 9, line 4, of the originally filed disclosure.)

Finally, the present disclosure teaches that “the developer 210 or administrator is queried using a second interface 900, shown in FIG. 9, to specify the properties of each type of option, i.e., for the *constraints associated with a given option group*, such as whether the various options (identified in window 950) within an option group can be used together in field 910 and any input file requirements in field 970.”
 15 (Page 11, lines 21-24, of the originally filed disclosure.)

Once the tool is registered, “the web page 1100 allows the *user to specify the arguments for the input files for the various option groups*, as appropriate.” (Page 12, lines 4-6, of the originally filed disclosure.)
 20

Kressin, however, does not disclose or suggest *options groups* as defined in the present invention, and does not disclose or suggest *specifying properties of options groups*. Independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 22 require *querying a user to specify properties of one or more option groups* provided by each of said software applications.

25 Thus, Kressin et al. do not disclose or suggest querying a user to specify properties of one or more option groups provided by each of said software applications, as required by independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 22.

Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-11 and 13-21

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-11 and 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kressin et al.
 30

Claims 2-7, 9-11 and 13-21 are dependent on claims 1, 8, 12, and 22, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Kressin et al. because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 22 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-22, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to
5 contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 14, 2005

10

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
15 (203) 255-6560